



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,635	12/12/2003	Krisztian Kiss	39700-793001US/NC39973US	1642
64046 7590 11/09/2010 MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND POPEO, P.C ONE FINANCIAL CENTER BOSTON, MA 02111				
EXAMINER NOORISTANY, SULAIMAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2478				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/09/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/733,635

Applicant(s)

KISS ET AL

Examiner

SULAIMAN NOORISTANY

Art Unit

2478

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 0200.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 20, 23 and 26-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 20, 23 and 26-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Detailed Action

This Office Action is response to the application (10/733635) filed on 10/28/2010

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/18/08 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 4-5, 7-9, 11, 20, 23, 26-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sanchez**. U.S. Patent App. No. **US 20020147845** in view of **NPL by Rosenberg 'Caller Preferences and Callee Capabilities for the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP)', March 2, 2003**.

Regarding claim 1, Sanchez teaches wherein a method comprising:

registering, in a controller entity comprising a call state control function is

met here by Sanchez ([0047; 0062-0063, 0066] e.g., the CSCF (Service Requester Node) receives a REGISTER request (S-10)), **a plurality of contact addresses for a user** is met here by Sanchez ([0011] e.g., plurality of user identifiers under different service environments);

receiving, at the controller entity, a request for a communication link to the user is met here by Sanchez ([0046; 0012] e.g., call establishment 'e.g., receiving and processing service requests from a Service Requester Node or from another UDS in the resolution domain');

querying, by the controller entity, a database at a home subscriber server for information regarding a manner regarding how to handle the request is met here by Sanchez ([0062] e.g., the CSCF preferably launches a query directly to the HSS (Server-3) (S-40));

processing, at the controller entity (**e.g., CSCF**), the request based on the queried information from the database (**e.g., query the HSS by CSCF - [0042-0048, 0066]**) wherein when provided during registration (**e.g., The UDS receiving the query (UDS-1) checks the received parameters, namely the user and/or service related data and, by inspection of its database records, UDS-1 encounters the appropriate server in charge of the specific user under the applicable service environment – [0031]**).

However, Sanchez does not explicitly disclose the terms "*the controller entity uses user preference information to determine whether to fork the request in parallel or sequentially*".

'ROSENBERG teaches that it is well known to have system wherein **'processing, at the controller entity, wherein when provided during registration, the controller entity uses user preference information to determine whether to fork the request in parallel or sequentially'** is met here by ROSENBERG (page. 6-8, Overview of Operation, Para. 4. Extracting Implicit Preferences, e.g., when a caller sends a request, it can optionally include new header fields which request certain handling at a server. These preferences fall into two categories. The first category, called request handling preferences, are carried in the Request-Disposition header field. They describe specific behavior that is desired at a server. Request handling preferences include whether the caller wishes the server to proxy or redirect, and whether sequential or parallel search is desired. These preferences can be applied at every proxy or redirect server on the call signaling path) in order to make the system efficient. Thus it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to modify Sanchez invention by utilizing a system in which the called party to be able to manipulate callers request and redirect the responses back based on the callers request or preferences.

Regarding claim 4, Sanchez and ROSENBERG together taught the method as in claim 1 above. Sanchez further teaches wherein the registering comprises registering the plurality of contact addresses for the user in the controller entity which is provided in association with a multimedia network" ([0017] e.g., application server for multimedia).

Regarding claim 5, Sanchez and ROSENBERG, together taught the method as in claim 1 above. Sanchez further teaches wherein the registering comprises the user registering the plurality of contact addresses in at least two different communication networks ([0011] e.g., plurality of user identifiers under different service environments; ROSENBERG: user registering plurality addresses [0002-0010]).

Regarding claim 7, Sanchez and ROSENBERG, together taught the method as in claim 1 above. Sanchez further teaches wherein the querying comprises applying a query to a sub-group of the known contact addresses (Sanchez: [0045] e.g., a UDS arranged for acting as an SLF comprises at least one Protocol Handler module for handling the received and answered queries from and to the CSCF node; ROSENBERG: user plurality addresses [0002-0010]).

Regarding claim 8, Sanchez and ROSENBERG, together taught the method as in claim 1 above, as described above. Sanchez further teaches wherein indicating and assigning handling instructions for at least one contact address independently during registration of the at least one contact address (Sanchez: [0011] e.g., plurality of user identifiers under different service environments; ROSENBERG: user plurality addresses [0002-0010]).

Regarding claim 9, Sanchez and ROSENBERG, together taught the method as in claim 1 above. Sanchez further teaches wherein the indicating and assigning comprises

indicating and handling the handling instructions for the at least one contact address by either the user or the database ([0031; 0038; 0045] e.g., UDS may be assigned at the Service Requester Node for handling the service request related queries by given means such as those carried out during discovery phase, during the start-up phase, or by configuration).

Claims 11, 20 have the similar limitation as of claim 1; therefore, it's rejected under the same rationale as in claim 1.

Regarding claim 23, Sanchez and ROSENBERG, together taught the method as in claim 1 above. ROSENBERG further teaches wherein the processing occurs in accordance with the information from the database if the request does not comprise any caller preferences, the caller preferences indicating if a request is to be forked in parallel or sequentially ([0002-0010] e.g., in case the fork-directive is set to "fork", then a parallel-directive indicates whether the caller would like the proxy server to proxy the request to all known addresses at once ("parallel"), or go through them sequentially, contacting the next address only after it has not received a final response for the previous one ("sequential")).

Claim 26-32 list all the same elements of **claim 1, 4-5, 7-9**, but in storage system rather than method form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to **claim 1, 4-5, 7-9** applies equally as well to **claim 23-32**.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's argument filed on 10/27/2010, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant Arguments:

In view of the foregoing, neither Herrero nor SIP discloses or suggests at least the following features of claim 1: "querying, by the controller entity, a database at a home subscriber server for information regarding a manner regarding how to handle the request" and "processing, at the controller entity, the request based on the queried information from the database, wherein, when provided during registration, the controller entity uses user preference information to determine whether to fork the request in parallel or sequentially."

Examiner response:

With respect to Applicant arguments, wherein neither Herrero nor SIP discloses or suggests at least the following features of claim 1:

"querying, by the controller entity, a database at a home subscriber server for information regarding a manner regarding how to handle the request" and

"processing, at the controller entity, the request based on the queried information from the database, wherein **when provided during registration**, the controller entity uses user preference information to determine whether to fork the request in parallel or sequentially." Examiner would like to draw attention to Fig. 1, [000042-0048; 0066] of Herrero, wherein the aforementioned UDS 10 is operable as the

Service Locator Function (SLF) acting as a secondary database for receiving queries from the CSCF, encountering the HSS in charge of a given subscriber, and answering the result to said CSCF.

In addition, [0011], wherein it is to be understood that "redirecting" in this context means answering the query with a server identifier, for the requester node issuing a new query towards the server. The UDS implements a secondary database with user and server identification information obtained from primary user databases, and is arranged for determining a specific network server in charge of a given user under a particular service environment (here is same as "querying, by the controller entity, a database at a home subscriber server for information regarding a manner regarding how to handle the request").

Examiner would like to draw attention to pg. 8, of SIP (NPL), wherein when a caller sends a request, it can optionally include new header fields which request certain handling at a server. These preferences fall into two categories. The first category, called request handling preferences, are carried in the Request-Disposition header field. They describe specific behavior that is desired at a server. Request

handling preferences include whether the caller wishes the server to proxy or redirect, and whether sequential or parallel search is desired. These preferences can be applied at every proxy or redirect server on the call signaling path.

The second category of preferences, called feature preferences, are carried in the Accept-Contact and Reject-Contact header fields. These header fields also contain

feature sets, represented by the same feature parameters that are used in the Contact header field. Here, the feature parameters represent the caller's preferences. The

Accept-Contact header field contains feature sets that describe UAS that the caller would like to reach. The Reject-Contact header field contains feature sets which, if matched by a UA, imply that the request should not be routed to that UA.

Proxies use the information in the Accept-Contact and Reject-Contact header fields to select amongst contacts in their target set. When neither of those header fields are present, the proxy computes implicit preferences from the request. These are caller preferences that are not explicitly placed into the request, but can be inferred from the presence of other message components. As an example, if the request method is INVITE, this is an implicit preference to route the call to a UA that supports the INVITE method.

Both request handling and feature preferences can appear in any request, not just INVITE. However, they are only useful in requests where proxies need to determine a request target. If the domain in the request URI is not owned by any proxies along the request path, those proxies will never access a location service, and therefore, never have the opportunity to apply the caller preferences. This makes sense; typically, the request URI will identify a UAS for mid-dialog requests. In those cases, the routing decisions were already made on the initial request, and it makes no sense to redo them for subsequent requests in the dialog (here is same as "processing, at the controller entity, the request based on the queried information from the database, wherein, when provided during registration, the

controller entity uses user preference information to determine whether to fork the request in parallel or sequentially"). Therefore, for the above reason, combination of Herrero and SIP (NPL) meet the claim limitations.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sulaiman Nooristany whose telephone number is (571) 270-1929. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Pwu, can be reached on (571) 272-6798. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197.

SN 11/4/2010

/Jeffrey Pwu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2478

